

of the first marriage; and it is assumed that monogamy can no more be inferred from the creation of Adam and Eve than the monogamy of brutes can be inferred from the fact that God created "animals in pairs." But animals are not social beings, and the logic which is essential to marriage cannot be predicated of them. I have no objection to an animal rising up and saying to its mate, "I will be true to you down to an animal. The unities of the brutes neglect their young; therefore—how mark the logic—therefore shall I follow thee, and I will not neglect their children? The bull does not stick to one cow—mark the logic—therefore a man should not stick to one wife." Therefore I say—mark the logic—the bulla are all polygamists. (Laughter and applause.) Such is the logical conclusion from the premises. But I have no objection to the proposition that is the expression "And they shall be one flesh," does not imply monogamy, for it is general, and applies to all the couples of the animal world. My answer to this objection is that wherever this expression occurs in the Bible it is in connection with the union of one man and one woman in such wedlock. As a preliminary, one fact should be stated—namely, that the expression "one flesh" is used in the Samaritan, in the Arabic and in the Samaritan the word "syria" is used. No let us take the Scripture pas-

The sixth commandment adultery, does include all criminal sexual intercourse. It is a generic term, and the whole includes the parts. It is like the word "kill." In the sixth commandment, which includes all those passions and emotions of the human soul which lead to murder, such as jealousy, envy, malice, hatred, revenge. So this word *nadash* includes adultery, fornication, adultery, and even incestuous marriage. Adultery and fornication are used interchangeably by our Lord, and mean the same thing. A married man who has sexual intercourse with another woman or her husband is admitted to be adultery, but Christ calls the act fornication. Matthew v, 27; Romans xiii, 9. The carnal connection of a man with an unmarried woman is positively declared adultery. In Job, xiv, 18-21, it is expressly said that an adulterer cannot add his crime with the barren and the widow. "The eye also of the adulterer watcheth for twilight, saying, I will conceal myself from the face of the LORD: he dark they dig through houses which they had not marked for themselves in too day time; they know not the light for the morning is to them even as the shadow of death; if one knew them they are in the terrors of the shadow of death. He is swift as the eagle upon the nest, he is as the eagle hovering over the fold; he holdeth not the way of the vineyards. Drought and heat consume the snow waters, so doth the grave.

is in Deut. xxi. 15-17—"If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated; then it shall be when he maketh his sons to inherit, that he shall make the son of the hated, which he loveth, his first-born, before the son of the beloved, which is indeed the first-born. But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated, his first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his." It is not to be supposed,—"If a man have two wives!" It is asserted that this implies that he had them simultaneously, which is a matter that may or may not be true; but that he might have had them in succession, and the law applies as logically and as truly. For instance, a woman first married by a man, and then married again; the second wife he loves better than the first; and I believe that is the general rule. Therefore, if a man has two wives, the first wife has children by both, and a shrewd woman having children, being a step-mother and a natural mother, would naturally not insist that her husband should confer special property favors on her children in preference to the children of the former wife. Now, if a man has two wives and children, if a man has married two wives and has children by both, he shall not out steal the rights of

that marriages are to be confined to brothers and sisters. More than this, it is asserted that if the fact of the creation of one man and one woman is monogamy, then the fact that the immediate sons of Adam married their sisters is sufficient to establish that marriage is to continue at not extended beyond brothers and sisters. Well, I accept the objection for argument's sake. But if we accept the fact that marriage is to be extended beyond brothers and sisters favors polygamy or plurality of wives so it favors polyandry, or plurality of husbands. If the fact that the immediate sons of Adam can have many wives is polyandry, and if the law of God justifies the creation of it, then the right (Applause.) Polygamists refer to the practice of polyandry. It is extended to-day in some portions of the earth. It is a common sight on the one hand then polyandry is not on the other. But the polygamists say that if the monogamy is the fact of the creation, then the monogamy and one woman, is no sanction in that, because the immediate children of Adam and Eve were married. So the fact of the creation is the argument? Some acts are wrong in themselves, some acts are wrong in virtue of a violation of law. The acts of Adam and Eve were wrong in virtue of violating the forbidden fruit, and the act of Adam in killing his brother. Murder derives its criminal character from the constitution of things, and the

And those who make that assertion enumerate Vermont, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New York. If they enumerate those new States as having an excess of females, I am prepared to ennumerate Alabama, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Oregon, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Texas, Nebraska and Nevada, and the Territories of New Mexico, Colorado, Dakota and Washington, in all of which there is an excess of males. I am prepared to assert that between ages of fifteen and thirty there are 91,000 more males than females in the United States. I cannot see how the argument cannot hinge upon what is said in a marriageable age. But we must take a broader view of the human race, and consider the great law touching the equality of the sexes; this will be substantiated by the facts of the census. The census of 1850 shows that there is an overbalance from the census. Suppose there are in United States 50,000 more marriageable females than males and a population of 3,000,000. There are 1,000,000 more females than brought to go around once we all Mormon elders some poor fellows would be doomed by the scanty provision of the United States of 50,000 of marriageable men and 1,000,000 of marriageable women and surplus of 950,000 of